

From: Mark Anderson
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:51 PM
Subject: Proposed rule change

Dear Commissioner,

Tomorrow's vote whether to allow media companies to own more radio and television stations in an area is a crucial one.

Please keep the current standard. I strongly urge you to consider that the Public owns the airwaves, not corporations. Most of us want more options, not monopolies on what is seen and heard. Local stations have already been compromised by media mergers with less local response to emergencies and investigative reporting. We need local independent stations that are not afraid to tell the truth, no matter who may be embarrassed by information. It is the public interest that should be served.

Thank you for your time and attention,
Mark and Mary Anderson
Matthew Anderson
Bright Anderson

From: Sree Vemulapalli
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:52 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Sree Vemulapalli (sree_vemulapalli@lycos.com) writes:

Thanks for taking the stand that you did today and being so vocal on C-SPAN. Please keep up the good work.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.47.24.83
Remote IP address: 68.47.24.83

From: Bill McClendon
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:52 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Bill McClendon (toprad@comcast.net) writes:

Dear Mr. Commissioner: I deeply appreciate your well reasoned dissent in today's rulings. As a broadcaster for more than 30 years, I am both saddened and I am fearful of the days to come. It seems that the majority of the American people can be swayed by media exposure. If the message is concentrated/orchestrated, then media giants will wield more power than anyone in government; even the government itself.

Our once great democracy is being dismantled one deregulatory step at a time by the forces of big, corrupt money. I am outraged.

What can I do as a citizen, taxpayer and voter to help reverse/stop today's horror? Please help. Thank you for your voice of opposition. I have sent a similar comment to Commissioner Copps

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.62.193.87
Remote IP address: 68.62.193.87

From: Brad Penner
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:54 PM
Subject: RE: Common Man

Well I see and hear that your group has decided to let the media monster grow even bigger. Some of you did a fine job of setting the foundation stones for killing any other possible broadcasted opinions.

Is your group so limited to not consider the possibilities of a huge one minded thought steering committee coupled with the newly BPCR that our politicians passed? Maybe you did, but thought protecting the elected was better. Basically your group has further solidified the election process will be determined by the media.

I hope your proud, because it just adds another chapter to how the gov protects itself. It sure would be nice to be able to vote for or against the employment of all gov employees. But then again, the gov has protected itself wonderfully. Makes me ill...

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Brad Penner

> Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2003 10:29 AM

> To: 'mpowell@fcc.gov'; 'kabernat@fcc.gov'; 'mcopps@fcc.gov'; 'kjmweb@fcc.gov'; 'jadelste@fcc.gov'

> Subject: Common Man

>

> I am just a common man in this wonderful country of ours. But I understand that not all people want to be common. Some want serious control of others.

>

> With out your protection and scrutiny, our media would become so biased to what the select group of owners deem correct for us to see, hear, read that the loss of true knowledge would be unbelievable.

>

> For example, the Arab television and radio. They only broadcast what they want you to believe. Doesn't matter if it is true. Quite concerning to me is such activity. And without your help to maintain no media monopolies, this thought steering activity will become acceptable for our media.

>

> Please, do not relax any broadcast ownership rules. They get by with too much as it is.

>

> Many years ago a founding father of our great nation stated that the First Amendment does not protect the spreading of untruths and lies through the press. Consider that for one moment. These guys were light years ahead of the politicians we now have. If we relax our rules to allow even more biased reporting thru a single minded controlled media, it's basically another step towards a media run dictatorship of the USA.

>

> Please, I prefer to remain a voice, albeit a small common man's voice, but a voice it is. Taking the right away is just another small reduction of individual liberties to silence the masses.

>

> Brad Penner

> Mesquite, TX.

From: Deirdre Kornhiser
To: Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:55 PM
Subject: Don't deregulate FCC ownership restrictions!!!!!! you'll help ruin this county !!!

The information contained in this electronic message is confidential, intended solely for the addressee(s), and may constitute privileged communications or attorney work product. Any unauthorized access, use, reproduction, transmission, disclosure, or dissemination is prohibited. Neither MOUND, COTTON, WOLLAN & GREENGRASS nor the author assumes any legal liability or responsibility for any incorrect, misleading, or altered information contained in this electronic message.

From: Ethel Hopkins
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, jadeiste@fcc.gov
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:55 PM
Subject: New FCC Rules for Broadcasting

Dear Sir:

I am writing to express my opinion that the changes the FCC is considering favor industry at the expense of the citizenry. I am against increasing the power that corporate interests have over public broadcasting. Please vote no on the new proposals being considered today.

Ethel Hopkins
Registered California Voter

From: greg jacobs
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:58 PM
Subject: congratulations on selling out your soul

From: Melissa Metzler
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:59 PM
Subject: Please Do Not Change Regulations

Ms Abernathy,

Please do not relax the FCC regulations on media ownership.

Melissa S Metzler
821 N Winchester
Chicago, IL 60622

From: Barbara Assadi
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:00 PM
Subject: media consolidation decision

Dear Mr. Powell et al:

I am outraged at today's vote to weaken restrictions on media ownership. This is just one more example of an apparently purposeful desire to keep the public uninformed or misinformed on many issues so that the greedy and connected can continue to feed at the trough. If the public does manage to find out what is taking place, there is a consistent pattern of arrogant disregard for anything anyone outside of the circle of the chosen few thinks.

With regard to media consolidation, I should think the fact that I only heard of this several weeks ago while watching a PBS program is quite telling. If it is such a great idea, then how come it was not being discussed on commercial stations such as Fox, and in the newspapers? Furthermore, the monopoly cable companies have on geographic areas should be another argument against media consolidation: I pay \$55.25 per month to Comcast (with no premium package), and there is still virtually nothing to watch! How many times do I want to see the Jaws movies, or Indiana Jones?

Barbara Assadi, AKA Barbara Garth

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, senator@boxer.senate.gov

From: Jan Andersen
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:02 PM
Subject: Shame on you!

Dear Commissioners.

Shame on you for your antidemocratic actions of rewriting the rules to benefit media conglomerates. TV news programs are already nearly worthless, and these revisions are making them completely worthless and suspect. Those of us seeking news that doesn't spew out of the corporate mindset will turn more and more to other sources--the Internet, international news sources, news magazines.

Janice Andersen
Eureka, CA

From: Bill Heffern
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner
Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:11 PM
Subject: Media Concentration

In the interest of diversity in news reporting, I disagree with the further concentration of media ownership.

William J. Heffern
602 Salisbury St.
Meyersdale, Pa. 15552

From: Robert Lee
To: robertslee@comcast.net
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:16 PM
Subject: Business Week on media consolidation

Snippet:

The FCC tends to be pretty cavalier about how it handles public comment in general. For instance, Concerned Women for America, a conservative group that aims to ensure that "Biblical principles" are followed in American public policy, discovered late last year that the FCC received nearly 7,000 indecency complaints about CBS' Victoria's Secret Lingerie TV show -- and logged them as a single complaint. As a result, Concerned Women says, the FCC officially counted only 97 complaints received during the fourth quarter.

MAY 30, 2003

MOVEABLE FEAST
By Thane Peterson

Stop the FCC's Covert Operation
Michael Powell & Co. seem determined to ignore overwhelming public opposition and endorse a secret proposal on media consolidation

[Printer-Friendly Version](#)

[E-Mail This Story](#)

[Moveable Feast Archive](#)

[Find More Stories Like This](#)

[An AOL-Microsoft Goliath? Not Likely](#)

[Mr. Bush Lights a Fire](#)

[Just How Big a Stimulus?](#)

[What the Cuts Mean to You](#)

[Hedging Your Bets on the Tax Cut](#)

[Practical Advice from a Tax Planner](#)

[If It's Dividend-Payers You Want...](#)

[A Texas-Size Feud for Sam Wyly](#)

The Women of Tech

Media Merger Mania: The First Wave

Stop the FCC's Covert Operation

Q&A with Tribune's Dennis FitzSimons

Q&A: Pollack Broadcasting's President

SBA Chief: Judge Us By Our Results

Transparency and Good Governance

Biotech Hurdles

Cyber Alert: Portrait of an Ex-Hacker

ADP: This Ugly Mutt Is Worth Adopting

More Headlines

Here's a quiz. Name a hot political issue that unites the following people and groups:

Singer Neil Diamond

The National Rifle Assn.

The Consumers Union, the organization that publishes Consumer Reports

Senator Trent Lott (R-Miss.)

Media mogul Ted Turner, founder of CNN

Entertainment and Internet mogul Barry Diller

The National Organization for Women

Conservative New York Times columnist William Safire

Code Pink, Women for Peace, an antiwar group

The African American/Asian American/Hispanic Caucus of Congress

Story Continues Below Ad

The answer: All are publicly opposed to the Federal Communications Commission's plans to vote on new rules governing media ownership on June 2. It's not clear exactly what the FCC will be voting on because, incredibly, Commission Chairman Michael Powell has never deigned to make public the 250-page document laying out the plan. But the general idea is to loosen rules that restrict the share any one company can own of the national TV market and allow cross-ownership of TV stations and newspapers in local markets.

Most analysts believe the changes would lead to a wave of consolidation in the national media market, which is already dominated by a handful of big companies such as AOL TimeWarner (AOL), Viacom (VIA), and News Corp. (NWS).

APPALLED AND UNITED. Barring a last-minute change of heart, Powell intends to go ahead with the vote, despite requests for a delay from the two Democrats (out of five members) on the FCC and a passel of lawmakers from both parties. Powell won't share the details of the plan even with Congress.

This is undemocratic and disgraceful. Whether you're conservative, liberal, or in the middle, we should all be appalled by the way the FCC is acting in this case.

First off, allowing further consolidation of the U.S. media business is wrong on its face. Most of the usual "bigger is better" arguments don't apply. Media companies don't face the same sort of harsh foreign competition that confront auto and steel companies, for instance, partly because foreign ownership of them is restricted.

Moreover, our system of government invests print and broadcast media with special privileges (one reason they're so profitable) but also with special responsibilities precisely because they are so important to the functioning of our democracy. The "efficiencies" that come with mergers will likely mean fewer reporters, less local news, and a diminishing of the debate democracy needs to function.

NEW MATH. New technology simply isn't taking up the slack. You may think what you know about the world comes from the Internet, radio, and TV. But most actual news gathering is still done by print organizations such as newspapers, news agencies like the Associated Press and Bloomberg, and news magazines like BusinessWeek. Rush Limbaugh, Matt Drudge, and your favorite news anchor may put a spin on information in the public domain, but they aren't out gathering it. In small and medium-sized communities, the local newspaper is the sole source of information about government policies and local elections. More consolidation is likely to hurt, not help.

Yet, Powell has held only one official public hearing on the proposed changes, and has refused to attend most of the ad hoc meetings held around the country by Kenneth Adelstein and Michael Copps, the two Democrats on the FCC. The reason, Powell says, is that he prefers to focus on empirical studies -- and, in any case, the public has had plenty of chance to comment via the FCC's Web Site (www.fcc.gov).

If you actually go to the site and read some of the empirical studies the FCC appears to be relying on, however, they're pretty appalling. I came away wondering, why is the FCC making such monumental decisions with so little real information to go on?

FUZZY LOGIC. The FCC staff seems to have bent over backward to conclude that media consolidation has few ill effects. Take this conclusion by staffers Keith Brown and George Williams last September as to why radio advertising rates soared 81% (68% excluding inflation) in the five years after the FCC deregulated the radio market. Almost all of the lift came from "economic growth," they conclude. Oh really.

Rates might have gone up even more without consolidation, the study says. "A greater presence of large national owners in a local market appears to decrease the advertising rates paid by national and regional advertising

agencies."

Does that make sense to you? It sure doesn't to me. If economic factors were, indeed, the cause of such a huge increase, why didn't radio ad rates plunge when the recession took hold last year? And why the emphasis on "national and regional" ad agencies when one of the FCC's mandates is to promote local diversity?

OVERWHELMING REACTION. The study glosses over one of the main problems with radio consolidation: That local advertisers have been squeezed out by big national ad firms. The truth is that as media markets consolidate, Wal-Mart (WMT) and K Mart (KM) may get good deals on radio ads, but a small, independent hardware store has a hard time getting its message across.

Worse, many of the studies by their own admission don't prove much of anything. For instance, David Pritchard, a journalism professor at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, analyzed coverage of the 2000 Presidential elections in 10 markets to see if newspapers and TV stations with the same owner tend to have a similar political slant. He was cautious in coming to any conclusions from such a small sample. But if you read the footnotes, you discover that four of the newspapers he discusses are owned by Tribune Co. (TRB), which has the relatively unusual policy of not requiring its cross-owned local outlets to coordinate their Presidential endorsements. Doesn't that make the study even less representative?

To its credit, the FCC has a wonderful Web site and an electronic system that makes it easy for citizens to comment on issues under consideration. To date, the FCC has received more than 20,000 comments on its plans to change media ownership rules -- and, as of a tally on May 8, they were running more than 99% against. In addition, NRA members sent some 300,000 postcards opposing the changes, and activist groups such as MoveOn.org have taken out ads in major newspapers criticizing the plans. Has the FCC considered this outpouring? We'll know on June 1, but don't hold your breath.

UNMENTIONABLE PROTESTS. In 2001, two university professors studied five FCC decisions going back to 1996 and found that none of the decisions reflected public comment. One FCC staffer interviewed for the study noted that electronic comments from average citizens carry little weight with the commission because they are "nontechnical in nature."

The FCC tends to be pretty cavalier about how it handles public comment in general. For instance, Concerned Women for America, a conservative group that aims to ensure that "Biblical principles" are followed in American public policy, discovered late last year that the FCC received nearly 7,000 indecency complaints about CBS' Victoria's Secret Lingerie TV show -- and logged them as a single complaint. As a result, Concerned Women says, the FCC officially counted only 97 complaints received during the fourth quarter.

The bottom line here: If the FCC isn't listening to the public, it isn't acting in the public good. To go ahead with this vote on June 1 would be a travesty of public service.

Peterson is a contributing editor at BusinessWeek Online. Follow his weekly Moveable Feast column, only on BusinessWeek Online

Edited by Douglas Harbrecht

Click to buy an e-print or reprint of a BusinessWeek or BusinessWeek Online story or video.

Add news from BusinessWeek Online to your Web site with our headline feed.

To subscribe online to BusinessWeek magazine, please click here.

Learn more, go to the BusinessWeekOnline home page

Robert Lee
Encoda
Office 610-397-1632
Home 610-642-9707
Cell 610-724-1288

From: Stephen Borowski
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:22 PM
Subject: Newly approved media outlet ownership rules

Sir:

I am deeply and personally insulted by the arrogance displayed by the partisan majority of the Federal Communications Commission today. Quite apart from your perspective of the previous regulatory scheme as being "outmoded", you have seen fit to defy overwhelming public sentiment against these rule changes. I have been patronized. Perhaps such behavior is appropriate in the context of a parent-child relationship, but I am not your child. I am your employer. I denounce this decision - and thereby add yet another small shovelful of earth to the mountain of public opinion you ignore with impunity, because "you know better". Both the public airwaves and the cherished ideal of government of the people, by the people and for the people have again been offered for sale to whoever can afford to buy them, even though I as their owner am not willing to sell either. Shame on you.

Stephen J. Borowski
sborowski@wideopenwest.com

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Bob Schlapfer
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:28 PM
Subject: New (NON) regulations

I found no place to express my outrage at the votes that your commission have committed. To allow the public airwaves to be controlled by a wealthy few is irresponsible and should not be allowed. How in the world are the little citizens.....who OWN the airwaves (and that is nearly a joke) going to be able to compete against the likes of Murdock et al, who have declared that they intend to control everything. Can impeach YOU???

Eleanor Schlapfer, Gustine, California

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy: kabernat@fcc.gov
Commissioner Michael J. Copps: mcopps@fcc.gov
Commissioner Kevin J. Martin: kjmweb@fcc.gov
Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein: jadelste@fcc.gov

From: Kris HCA
To: Brock Fekken, ECFSHelp, Bill Cline, Cores, FCC FCCTSR49, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell, FCC FCCINFO
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:28 PM
Subject: Very displeased about the FCC VOTE!

I was VERY DISAPOINTED to learn this news.

[illegible]

FCC adopts media ownership rules

NEW YORK (CNN/Money) - The Federal Communications Commission narrowly approved new media ownership rules Monday, allowing television broadcasters to expand their reach, despite fears the move may reduce the variety of viewpoints available to consumers.

The Republican-led government agency voted 3-2 to allow the broadcast networks to own television stations that reach a combined 45 percent of the national audience, up from 35 percent.

[illegible]

So it seems like no matter if every man, woman and child in America stood outside the doors of the FCC and protested, Chairman Powell's and the other Republican chairmen's votes had already been bought by the corporate media conglomerates and sanctioned by the Bush Administration a long time ago.

The good news is that this will be a very simple example with which to help educate the American public that the Bush Administration and the Republican party is out of touch with the American people. While the war on Iraq is a much more complicated issue, the FCC rules are an obvious case of pandering to Big-business over the needs of the public.

So thanks for the obvious example!

And know that the battle for the airwaves is not over! Public advocacy groups like MOVE-ON have united together and gained new members during the fight over the FCC vote, and thus the campaigns those groups will be able to launch will be more united and even stronger than before.

**So thanks for uniting differing groups into attacking a common front.
Thanks for the strengthening of our ranks and our resolve!**

[illegible]

Sincerely,

Kris T.
American Citizen

From: E. S. Bent
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:30 PM
Subject: FCC - June 2, 2003 Decision

With all due respect, after today's vote, I must speak as plainly as I can. Please take the thoughts below for what they are: one citizen/voter's opinion. Of course, I could be wrong. But it does appear to be ok now to let freedom slip-slide away if it doesn't help the bottom line. Or will we stand up and fight this erosion of our liberty? -- Very truly concerned, Emily Susan Bent.

Wild America

There sits the august FCC
Poised to strike a blow for liberty
After all, they say, the rules have changed
What with technology, you know, and the Internet
And the news - papers, radio, and TV
Will now have much more diversity
When corporations own even more of the pie
When every village hears the same damn lie . .
But, wait: It's all good! they hasten to say
We'll all be winners in a big way
The bottom lines will be better fed and
We'll all have the right picture in our heads
It will be competition at its best
So, hey, give your mind a rest!
They will achieve economies of scale
Bringing us news without fail
All the news that is, that's fit
To give to the masses - the stupid twits!
And all the journalists will be shot
If, that is, they can't be bought

The freely flowing, babbling brooks
Damned by capitalistic crooks
And the forests of ideas, full of wonderful trees
Clear-cut without mercy - cut off at the knees
Differing views crackling on waves of clean air
Polluted by party line and more advertising fare -
It will be the dawn of a brand new age:
Wild America in a cage.

[5/16/03 -- (c) 2003 All Rights Reserved]

Emily Susan Bent

500 W. Lathrop Road

Columbia, Missouri

65203-2804

(Formerly of the State of Delaware)

CC: senator@breau.senate.gov, senator@dorgan.senate.gov, olympia@snowe.senate.gov,
senator@biden.senate.gov, senator@rockefeller.senate.gov, arlen_specter@specter.senate.gov,
senator_talent@talent.senate.gov, senator_leahy@leahy.senate.gov, senator@kennedy.senate.gov,
tom_harkin@harkin.senate.gov, russell_feingold@feingold.senate.gov

From: maxxusfilms
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:32 PM
Subject: A powful tool

This is a very powful tool
I expect you would like it.

From: Blair Levin, Rebecca Arbogast, & David Kaut
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:35 PM
Subject: FCC Relaxes Broadcast Limits: New Media Ownership Age Begins

- > FCC Relaxes Broadcast Limits: New Media Ownership Age Begins (full note below)
- > * As expected, the FCC today voted 3-2 to relax various broadcast ownership rules, which we believe will likely spur deal making and, over time, significant consolidation.
- > * The FCC raised the 35% national TV ownership cap to 45%, eased local TV ownership restrictions to allow "duopolies" in more markets and "triopolies" in the largest markets, rolled back a newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership ban in all but the smallest markets, and modified local radio-TV cross-ownership restrictions. The FCC did vote to keep current TV dual-network limits and to adopt a new radio market definition in an effort to prevent more local aggregations, such as those created by Clear Channel (CCU), but will not require divestitures of current holdings.
- > * We believe the potential winners include the large TV network owners (VIA, NWS/FOX, DIS, GE) and newspaper publishers that either have TV properties or are interested in acquiring them (TRB, GCI, BLC, MDP, HTV, MEG, and SSP), while the impact on smaller broadcast groups will depend more on their specific situations and business plans, with television aggregators gaining new opportunities and radio aggregators generally facing new restrictions.
- > CCU's existing combinations were not put at risk by the new radio market definition (and in some small number of situations it may create a buying opportunity), but pending transactions could be. And some smaller radio companies may not be able to complete their existing plans to buy more properties unless they qualify for special treatment.
- > * The liberalization of the rules also will tend to give media/broadcast conglomerates - such as VIA, DIS and NWS/FOX - greater leverage in their programming negotiations with cable operators, such as CMCSK, AOL, COX, CHTR, CVC.
- > * We believe the rule changes mean that over the next several years major players will have to be buyers or sellers, reshuffling their assets to take advantage of the new rules as well as respond to competitor moves. We think the first wave of deals will likely involve small-scale station swaps and acquisitions, as companies seek to strengthen their positions in local markets. We think there is likely to be a second wave of larger corporate combinations in which the buyer seeks to strengthen its leverage in the more vertically integrated media landscape.
- > * There is still a lot of political noise, particularly on the Hill,

- > where critics will continue to attack the
- > FCC's decision at hearings and in letters, and legislation has been
- > introduced to retain the 35% TV
- > cap. We also expect litigation to put some new rules at risk, though at
- > first glance we doubt the
- > basic direction of the FCC's liberalization is likely to be reversed.
- >
- > <<Media Ownership 602.pdf>>
- >
- > Blair Levin
- > blevin@leggmason.com
- > 202-778-1595
- >
- > Rebecca Arbogast
- > rarbogast@leggmason.com
- > 202-778-1978
- >
- > David Kaut
- > dpkaut@leggmason.com
- > 202-778-4341
- >
- > Daniel Zito
- > dezito@leggmason.com
- > 410-454-4333
- >
- >

IMPORTANT: The security of electronic mail sent through the Internet is not guaranteed. Legg Mason therefore recommends that you do not send confidential information to us via electronic mail, including social security numbers, account numbers, and personal identification numbers.

Delivery, and timely delivery, of electronic mail is also not guaranteed. Legg Mason therefore recommends that you do not send time-sensitive or action-oriented messages to us via electronic mail, including authorization to "buy" or "sell" a security or instructions to conduct any other financial transaction. Such requests, orders or instructions will not be processed until Legg Mason can confirm your instructions or obtain appropriate written documentation where necessary.

From: D.M. Johnson
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:41 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

D.M. Johnson (djohnso124@aol.com) writes:

Springtime in Berlin. Today's action should never have happened. The FCC should work for the people. I've never been so angry. Hopefully, this will mobilize the opposition to make sure this kind of power grab and special interest pandering can't happen again. Mike Powell heard enough--letters, emails, calls, protests--to know that this was a decision that needed hearings and an extended public debate. He didn't care. His arrogance needs to be rewarded with a swift kick. When he gets back from another free lunch with Rupert, why don't you give him one?

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 152.163.252.198
Remote IP address: 152.163.252.198

From: shawn saindon
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:47 PM
Subject: STOP LOOSENING MEDIA OWNERSHIP LIMITS

STOP LOOSENING MEDIA OWNERSHIP LIMITS

NO MORE MEDIA MONOPOLIES!!!

Add photos to your e-mail with MSN 8. Get 2 months FREE*.

From: therudys
To: FCC FCCINFO, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:49 PM
Subject: Keep rules the way they are!

Dear Sirs:

Please do NOT relax cross-ownership rules for TV and radio stations. It would NOT be in the public's best interest to allow mega-corporations to own up to 90% of the public's airwaves. We would like to keep some accountability and control over community standards and that will not be possible if YOU allow the elite few to control nearly everything. We also need access to a diverse group of programmers so that we can make informed decisions about important issues that will not be so easily silenced as they would be under the control of one or two powerful dictators. Please do what's best for the majority and not the few. Thank you.

Theresa Rudy of Florida

From: Walter ReMine
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:55 PM
Subject: Vote NO on relaxing restrictions against media consolidation!

Vote NO on relaxing restrictions against media consolidation!

-- Walter ReMine

St. Paul, MN

From: EubanksM@usa.redcross.org
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 3:00 PM
Subject: controlled news

(The opinions expressed herein are mine, personal and apart from my email address location.)

In these uncertain times, it amazes and distresses me that the FCC would/could even consider allowing an increase in the percentage of media ownership available to communication companies. I, for one, did not fall off a potato truck. There is an agenda at work that does not favor free speech, informed voters or entrepreneurs. Please do not change the percentage of ownership. We do not want or need Big Brother.
Mary C. Eubanks

From: Kathryn Nielsen
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 3:01 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Kathryn Nielsen (knielse@usd.edu) writes:

I apologize for the tone of my previous email towards you. I thought you were for the change, but after reading your statement online, I noticed a much different tone than the C-Span broadcast. You voted against it. With the protesters present it was difficult to determine who dissented. Thanks.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.33.233.214
Remote IP address: 64.33.233.214